

# Exiling Bishops: The Policy of Constantius II

WALT STEVENSON

Constantius II was forced by circumstances to make innovations in the policy that his father Constantine had followed in exiling bishops. While ancient tradition has made the father into a sagacious saint and the son into a fanatical demon, recent scholarship has tended to stress continuity between the two regimes.<sup>1</sup> This article will attempt to gather together

1 See T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius* (Cambridge, 1993), 145, who appears intent on emphasizing that Athanasius had no reason to complain about his treatment at the hands of his “anti-Christ” Constantius, since such treatment remained consistent with that of all bishops under the “orthodox” Constantine. Klaus Girardet emphasizes the universality of Constantine’s precedents by underlining a consistent, rational, and long-lasting juridical basis for the interactions between emperors and bishops. See K. M. Girardet, “Constance II, Athanase et l’édit d’Arles (353),” in *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d’Alexandrie*, ed. C. Kannengiesser (Paris, 1974), 63–91; “Appellatio: Ein Kapitel kirchlicher Rechtsgeschichte in den Kanones des vierten Jahrhunderts,” *Historia* 23.1 (1974): 98–127; *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht: Studien zu den Anfängen des Donatistenstreites, 313–15, und zum Prozess des Athanasius von Alexandrien, 328–46* (Bonn, 1975); “Die Petition der Donatisten an Kaiser Konstantin (Frühjahr 313)—historische Voraussetzungen und Folgen,” *Chiron* 19 (1989): 186–206; “Gericht über den Bischof von Rom: Ein Problem der kirchlichen und der staatlichen Justiz in der Spätantike (4.–6. Jahrhundert),” *HZ* 259.1 (1994): 1–38; *Die konstantinische Wende: Voraussetzungen und geistige Grundlagen der Religionspolitik Konstantins des Grossen* (Darmstadt, 2007); *Kaisertum, Religionspolitik und das Recht von Staat und Kirche in der Spätantike* (Bonn, 2009); and *Der Kaiser und sein Gott: Das Christentum im Denken und in der Religionspolitik Konstantins des Grossen* (Berlin, 2010). E. Wirbelau, “Exil für den römischen Bischof?” *Saeculum* 59 (2008): 29–46, though following Girardet

all instances in which Constantius II exiled bishops and focus on a sympathetic reading of his strategy.<sup>2</sup> Though the sources for this period are muddled and require extensive sorting, a panoramic view of exile incidents reveals a pattern in which Constantius moved past his father’s precedents to mold a new, intelligent policy that would influence emperors for generations. Once accounts of Constantius’s banishment of a variety of non- and semi-Nicene bishops are unearthed and contextualized, Constantius appears more as a capable administrator attacking practical imperial

closely, finds one exceptional case—the bishop of Rome Liberius’s exile—that, he argues, set new precedents for later imperial usage. E. Fournier, “Exiled Bishops in the Christian Empire: Victims of Imperial Violence?” in *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices*, ed. H. A. Drake (Burlington, VT, 2006), 157–66, provides a fascinating analysis of the next generation of exiled bishops after Constantius’s reign.

2 My analysis is influenced by R. Van Dam, *The Roman Revolution of Constantine* (Cambridge, 2007), 13: “Being a Christian emperor certainly raised practical problems for Constantine, for instance about his readiness to use coercive force or his attitudes toward bishops.” Van Dam succeeds best in demonstrating how the bishops, especially Marcellus of Ancyra and Eusebius of Caesarea, developed innovative methods for manipulating emperors (e.g., see 286–93). The book leaves us to wonder if Constantine had formulated a “policy” for disciplining disruptive bishops. My debt to Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, will be obvious, as it is in the work of all studying the reign of Constantius. Likewise, all who study Constantius are indebted to H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II.* (Berlin, 1984).

concerns than as a fanatic refereeing abstruse theological disputes.<sup>3</sup>

Timothy Barnes's contention that "Constantius both consistently observed and explicitly reasserted the principle that a bishop could be condemned and deposed only by a council of his peers, whatever the charge,"<sup>4</sup> may well capture the original intent of Constantine's middle son—namely, to imitate his father—but cannot explain all the incidents on the record. Though an attempt to define punitive banishments into two categories, execution of synodical rulings or traditional imperial efforts to preserve the state, certainly captures the ideal to which both emperor and bishops aspired, this model cannot explain several of the more complex and ambiguous exiles on the record.<sup>5</sup> And in addition to analyzing how Constantius adjudicated sentences of exile, it is important to investigate how he and his court discovered new practical mechanisms to ensure that exiled bishops remained exiled in areas where they could not continue to create disruptions. The latter mechanisms were little needed by Constantine, especially since he quickly recalled Arius's allies wherever they were sent after Nicaea, and he sent an apparently willing Athanasius off to Gaul during dangerous disruptions in Alexandria. In Constantius's case, it was only the experience of several painful lessons that led him to refine his methods—but these refinements and the resulting creative manipulations of bishops would become the basis for what we might call Byzantine bishop management.<sup>6</sup>

3 N. Henck, "Constantius ὁ φιλοκτίστης," *DOP* 55 (2001): 279–304, presents a new perspective on Constantius's ambitious, and often overlooked, building program.

4 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 145.

5 C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (Berkeley, 2006), 262, wisely qualifies her position: "Constantine's response usually consisted in referring the matter to a meeting of bishops, the decision of which he declared binding" (my italics). H. A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore, 2000), 106–7, is more direct: "Decrees of synods could not be enforced and could be contradicted by synods elsewhere. The only criteria for adjudicating between councils that reached contradictory conclusions were informal, with certain sees being accorded wider prestige than others because of the fame or antiquity of their community. . . . In the decades following Constantine, this lack of clear criteria for precedence and jurisdiction will become a cause of frequent turmoil."

6 For two colorful examples of Constantius's influence, see the treatment of John Chrysostom by Arcadius's court, A.-M.

As a preface to any reconstruction of Constantius's policy, a brief definition of what is meant by "exile" or "banishment" should help to illuminate the murkiness of the discussions in our sources. Daniel Washburn has recently published an excellent overview of banishment in late antiquity that serves as a timely background for this study. He states, "My purpose is . . . to create a general matrix for understanding the institution [of banishment] itself so that scholars treating individual instances can compare and contrast their materials with banishment's global patterns."<sup>7</sup> Particularly relevant to this article is his fourth chapter, in which he ponders several of the episodes discussed here and tackles the broader history of ecclesiastical exile as he comes to general conclusions far beyond the scope of my reconstruction of Constantius's specific policy.<sup>8</sup>

Since this is a study of the emperor's strategy for episcopal exile, it will be worthwhile first to pause and consider what it meant for synods to exile a bishop. From the time bishops came to power we hear of exiles—for instance, a successful effort to exile the disgraced heresiarch Marcion from Sinope in the 140s.<sup>9</sup> But in the minds of most of us, the actual process of exiling a bishop remains fuzzy.<sup>10</sup> Though early

Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome—Lettres à Olympias*, 2nd ed., SC 13 (Paris, 1968), passim, and even the Vandal king Thrasimund's banishment of Fulgentius of Ruspe, PL 65:1–844 and S. T. Stevens, "The Circle of Bishop Fulgentius," *Traditio* 38 (1982): 327–41. John Chrysostom left colorful details of his escort by soldiers eastward and of the conditions once in Armenia, concluding with his reaction to a second, fatal destination in modern Georgia. King Thrasimund exiled all Nicene bishops out of his North African kingdom in 506; among them was the young Fulgentius, who departed to find his literary career in Sardinia.

7 D. Washburn, *Banishment in the Later Roman Empire, 284–476 CE* (New York, 2013), 1.

8 Washburn, *Banishment*, 82–97. Washburn argues that banishment was intended to reform as well as to remove undesirable bishops. I will treat the first two efforts at "reform" less generously, as forced reeducation.

9 Epiphanius, *Panarion* 2.92, in *Epiphanius*, ed. K. Holl, vol. 2, *Panarion* (Leipzig, 1922), 92. Most scholars assume that Marcion was a suffragan bishop under his father in Sinope, and he surely took on the role of bishop in his subsequent evangelism.

10 The literature on early Christian "discipline" does not seem vast. Washburn provides a bibliography; two works he did not include are M. Pfeiffer, *Paenitentia Secunda: Das kirchliche Bußverfahren im Frühen Christentum* (Leipzig, 2003), and K. Hein, *Eucharist and Excommunication: A Study in Early Christian Doctrine and Discipline* (Frankfurt, 1975). The bibliography on ancient exile has

Christians shunned members of the congregation who were deemed heretical,<sup>11</sup> there are no examples of punitive exile in Christian literature before the mid-second century. The degree to which early synods based their practice of exile on Roman political precedents will be difficult to ascertain.<sup>12</sup> For instance, the emperor Augustus exiled his nephew Agrippa Postumus to the island of Planasia.<sup>13</sup> A political figure such as the *princeps* could harness his soldiers to transport, guard, and eventually kill the exile, if necessary. For a synod the easy step was to vote to exile a bishop, though it lacked any well-defined way to sustain its authority over a presiding bishop. But successive problems ensued, all concerned with how to enforce the exile. Augustus had a praetorian prefect and troops at his command, while a group of bishops had little more than their mercurial local monks, if that, ready at hand to enforce an exile. Could bishops credibly enforce exile in the sense established by Roman power?<sup>14</sup> If not, what exactly did these bishops mean by “exile”?

A few linguistic points will be useful here.<sup>15</sup> In the Greek-speaking world that dominates our discussion of

been growing recently but is still mostly focused on practices of city-states and literary reactions to these practices: most interesting, in addition to Washburn’s list, are P. Blaudeau, ed., *Exil et relégation: Les tribulations du sage et du saint durant l’Antiquité romaine et chrétienne (I<sup>er</sup>–VI<sup>e</sup> s. ap. J.-C.)* (Paris, 2008), and F. Stini, *Plenum exiliis mare: Untersuchungen zum Exil in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart, 2011). See also R. Gorman, “Poets, Playwrights, and the Politics of Exile and Asylum in Ancient Greece and Rome,” *International Journal of Refugee Law* 6.3 (1994): 402–24.

11 E.g., Rom 16:17–18 and 1 Cor 5.

12 Wirbelau, “Exil für den römischen Bischof?” 38–40, discusses the interesting cases exposed by the *Chronograph of 354*.

13 Suet., *Aug.* 65; Tac., *Ann.* 1.4–6.

14 Canon law discussions have gone into great detail on this issue. Girardet, “L’édit d’Arles,” 87–88, surveys them broadly and concludes: “Du point de vue du droit processif, le ‘Reichssynode’ fonctionne comme un *consilium* du *iudex* public; ainsi la compétence juridique des évêques, en tant que *consiliarii*, se limite à connaître de la question de culpabilité, ils ne peuvent pas prononcer une sentence pénale exécutoire. . . . Enfin le *iudex terrenus* [emperor] qui dirige le procès prononce la sentence pénale en se basant sur la culpabilité reconnue par les évêques-*consiliarii*, sentence frappant non pas un évêque en fonctions, mais un *homo privatus*.” How clearly such a process was understood in the period from 337 to 361 is a question more pertinent to the topic here.

15 Washburn, *Banishment*, 16–40, delivers a magisterial overview of the history of Roman exile language and in particular the complexities of legal terms in Latin.

Constantius’s reign, the most formal term for exile was φυγή. But this formal term and its cognates are by no means used consistently, and words as varied as ἀπωθεῖν (to drive away), ἀφορίζειν (to banish), ἔξελαύνειν (to drive out), ἔξορίζειν (to send beyond the frontier), ἔξοστρακίζειν (to banish by vote/ostracize), and σχολάζειν (to take some time off)—all almost always translated as “exile”—leave a sense that no formal legal concept was at play here comparable to, say, φυγή/φύγας/φεύγειν used by the classical Athenian state. I suspect that linguistically the bishops are creating a complex metaphor when they borrow the language of legal, state-sanctioned exile. Of course, they were aware that they were not acting as the Athenian citizens did through ostracism or as the Roman senate and its leaders had by *senatus consulta*; rather, as an unprecedented nongovernmental body, they were adopting the language of state exile. It should be pointed out that in so doing they were abandoning the informal shunning language of Christian tradition.<sup>16</sup> While we do not possess the actual words of condemnation produced by the Council of Nicaea, we do have the letter of recantation in which Eusebius and Theognis use the official language of exile: “But if your holy council was persuaded, we will not strive against it, but agreeing with your judgments, by this statement, we designate our full approval, not because we regret our exile, but rather to shed the suspicion of heresy.”<sup>17</sup> By assuming metaphorically the tone of a deliberative, legislative body adjudicating the fate of a citizen, the bishops awkwardly draw attention to their genuine lack of executive power.<sup>18</sup>

16 For example, 1 Cor 5:11–12: νῦν δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν μὴ συναναμίγγειτε ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος ἡ πόρνος ἢ πλεονέκτης ἢ εἰδωλολάτρης ἢ λοιδόρος ἢ μέθυσος ἢ ἄρπαξ, τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν. See also 2 Thess 3:14–15: Εἰ δέ τις οὐχ ὑπακούει τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, τοῦτον σημειοῦσθε, μὴ συναναμίγγειτε αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἐντραπῇ· καὶ μὴ ὡς ἔχθρὸν ἡγεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ νοιθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν (throughout, all underscoring is mine). *The Greek New Testament*, ed. K. Aland et al. (Stuttgart, 1968).

17 Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.14.4, in *Histoire ecclésiastique*, ed. P. Maraval and P. Périchon, vol. 1, SC 477 (Paris, 2004), 168: Εἰ δὲ ἐπείσθη ἡ ἀγία ὑμῶν σύνοδος, οὐκ ἀντιτείνοντες, ἀλλὰ συντιθέμενοι τοῖς παρ’ ὑμῖν κεκριμένοις καὶ διὰ τοῦ γράμματος πληροφοροῦμεν τὴν συγκατάθεσιν, οὐ τὴν ἔξορίαν βαρέως φέροντες, ἀλλὰ τὴν ὑπόνοιαν τῆς αἰρέσεως ἀποδυόμενοι.

18 We see the earliest evidence of this tendency in the following letter from the Council of Nicaea to the city of Alexandria, in a section passing judgment on Meletius, *Urkunde* 23.6, in *Athanasius Werke*, ed. H. G. Opitz, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1934–41), 3:48–49: “The

The ground metaphor of exile, by its nature, begs for execution by a state official with worldly authority. And as Klaus Girardet spells out, this official was invariably the emperor. To sum up our working definition, this study will consider the topic of “exile” to encompass any threat, sentence, or execution of such threat or sentence, made by either a synod or the emperor or some combination of the two, to remove a bishop from his episcopacy. Vague though this may sound, our focus on Constantius and his goals requires an inspection of all attempts to remove bishops during his reign. Bishops voted out ecclesiastical enemies and expected the state to execute their verdicts, which Constantius, in turn, manipulated to build his own policy.

The actual episodes of episcopal banishment as they unfold from the 320s to the 350s tell the story of Constantius’s innovations, so the form of exposition is necessarily chronological. At the same time, owing to thin scholarship on several episodes and controversy surrounding others, the narrative of this article will need to delve into source analysis and scholarly disagreements. The central argument, however, will come through in the clear story that the episodes tell. Constantine, as he recognized the political power and destabilizing effect of certain bishops, started to threaten exile and eventually made a few lackadaisical efforts at banishment, mainly aimed at the Arian party after Nicaea. But Constantius, upon the death of his father, was immediately met with the unique challenge of Paul, bishop of Constantinople; soon, after failing several times to banish Paul permanently, he faced a crisis. Constantius applied some of the lessons he learned from that failed attempt in successfully exiling Paulinus of Trier to the hinterland of Anatolia. While Paulinus’s exile became the template, the growing challenge to his regime posed by Athanasius, together with the dissidence of other savvy and prominent bishops

Council took pity on Meletius, although strictly speaking he was wholly undeserving of favor, and decreed that he remain in duty in his own city but exercise no authority either to ordain or nominate for ordination; they also moved that he appear in no other district or city on this pretense, retaining no more than the normal level of authority” (translation adapted from an adaptation of *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series*, ed. P. Schaff and H. Wace, 14 vols. [New York, 1890–1900], 2:12, available on the Fourth Century Christianity website, [www.fourthcentury.com/urkunde-23/](http://www.fourthcentury.com/urkunde-23/)). In this letter they explicitly refuse to restate their condemnation of Arius, Secundus, and Theonas.

allied with Athanasius, forced him to further innovations. After his creative banishments succeeded by the fall of 357 in neutralizing the Athanasian faction, he was forced to bring his skills to bear on the eastern, anti-Athanasian bishops, whom he exiled even more freely and thereby neutralized. Constantius celebrated his success with the gala dedication of Constantinople’s Church of the Holy Apostles on 15 February 360. Of course, unforeseen circumstances unrelated to episcopal friction would soon bring his regime down, but his policy of exiling bishops should be seen as a success.

### Constantine’s Record on Episcopal Banishment

Beyond Washburn, I have not found much discussion in the scholarly literature of Constantine’s precise practice of exiling bishops—an understandable situation, given the paucity of ancient source material pointing to an order of exile from Constantine.<sup>19</sup> Outside of the exiles of Arius’s colleagues and Athanasius, cases that will be examined in detail below, we see almost no punitive banishment. On the other hand, we have evidence that Constantine was willing to threaten uncanonical exile.<sup>20</sup> For instance, Athanasius quotes a brief passage from a letter he received from the emperor in 328, seven years before the emperor sent him to Gaul:

19 Washburn, *Banishment*, 48–49, tersely sums up Constantine’s record. The sources are not in agreement on what happened to Arius’s episcopal colleagues after Nicaea. The ecclesiastical historians agree that the council forbade his supporters, Secundus of Ptolemais and Theon of Marmarica, from returning to their episcopal homes; see Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.9, in *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. F. Winkelmann, 3rd ed. (Berlin, 1981), 10; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.6, in *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. L. Parmentier and F. Scheidweiler, GCS 44 (Berlin, 1954), 33. Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.8 (SC 477:102), adds a few more depositions to the list. Eusebius’s *Life of Constantine* is silent concerning exile and very positive that Constantine’s exhortations to harmony were successful: *VC* 2.17–23 (GCS 57:55–58). T. Barnes, “The Exile and Recalls of Arius,” *JTS* 60 (2009): 109–29, asserts that Constantine did exile Arius and argues at length against Brennecke and his supporters regarding the dates of readmission into communion/imperial favor. See also Sozom., *HE* 2.27 (GCS 50:90), on Constantine’s reconciliation with Arius. At the least, it is safe to say that we have little solid evidence to draw on in discussing Constantine’s practice of exiling bishops.

20 Washburn, *Banishment*, 48, calls attention to Constantine’s innovation in sending threats of banishment to bishops.

Since you know my will now, let everyone who wishes enter safely into the church. For if I know that you have hindered or barred entrance to anyone who is in communion with the church, I will immediately send someone by my command to depose you and remove you from your territory[.]<sup>21</sup>

There is little reason to doubt the authenticity of this fragment, nor is there much ambiguity. Constantine was using the threat of deposition and exile to discipline disruptive bishops, and he clearly felt comfortable doing so without making any reference to calling a synod.<sup>22</sup> In this case, he presumably is implying that any potential efforts by Athanasius to bar Meletians from communion would defy the conclusions of Nicaea.

On the other hand, it should be pointed out how quietly and secretly the emperor could, and did, send his message to Athanasius. No one should forget that a few years earlier Constantine's rival for the throne, Licinius, had been banishing and even torturing bishops. Some of them—Paphnutius, for instance—had become celebrities at the Council of Nicaea. This humble bishop had been exiled by Licinius to the mines and at some point tortured so severely that he lost an eye and the use of his left leg.<sup>23</sup> He was reported to have been celebrated by Constantine at the meetings of the Council, and some even said that the emperor publicly

kissed the wound over the confessor's lost eye.<sup>24</sup> In this case, after Constantine's dramatic victories at the battles of the Hellespont and Chrysopolis ended Licinius's persecution, the bishops were free to celebrate their return from exile. But Constantine, little more than a year after Licinius's defeat, must have been aware of the delicacy of the issue. Would he want to be viewed in the same light as the persecutor Licinius when the bishops at Nicaea were deposing Arius and his fellows? It is certainly plausible that Constantine was worried about appearing to engage in the oppression of any bishops. For this reason, he only sent threatening letters to those like Athanasius, a bishop who seemed likely to cause serious trouble. Publicly, the emperor enacted the sober judgments of synods; privately, threats of unilateral action were in play.

Doubtless Constantine also had evoked the ancient imperial right to banish subjects who posed a danger to the public peace or to government stability.<sup>25</sup> But was he willing to cross the boundary from threat to action against a holy bishop? Several events confirm that he was, including the banishment of Arius's followers after Nicaea and perhaps Athanasius's exile to Gaul in 335.<sup>26</sup> In the case of the Arian bishops Secundus, Theonas, Eusebius, Theognis, and Maris,<sup>27</sup> we can infer that the emperor was the enforcer of canonical convictions, while in the case of Athanasius we have something more difficult to grasp.

Our sources show that the bishops at Nicaea ordered the depositions by majority vote. Then we read Socrates and Sozomen as implying that Constantine disseminated an edict to exile members of Arius's retinue from their sees.<sup>28</sup> Such an action merely

21 All translations are the author's unless noted otherwise. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos* 59 (in Opitz 2:140): "Ἐχων τοίνυν τῆς ἐμῆς βουλήσεως τὸ γνώρισμα ἀπασι τοῖς βουλομένοις εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰσελθεῖν ἀκώλυτον παράσχου τὴν εἰσόδον. ἐὰν γάρ γνῶ ὡς κεκαλυκάς τινας αὐτῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας μεταποιουμένους ἡ ἀπειρξας τῆς εἰσόδου, ἀποστέλω παραχρῆμα τὸν καὶ καθαιρήσοντά σε εξ ἐμῆς κελεύσεως καὶ τῶν τόπων μεταστήσοντα. The *Synodicon Vetus* 40, in *The Synodicon Vetus*, ed. J. Duffy and J. Parker (Washington, D.C., 1979), 34, has Athanasius banished by a "council" (συνέδριον) along with Komates, Euphrates of Anteradus, Euprepious of Adrianople, Lucius the Confessor (of Adrianople), and Marcellus of Ancyra.

22 Washburn, *Banishment*, 46–52. An emperor's unilateral exile of a bishop would undermine the fifth canon of the Council of Nicaea. On the other hand, the tradition of canon law argued that the emperor, from the first precedent of Constantine, had the duty to sentence and to execute a sentence after a synod made its ruling; Girardet, "L'édit d'Arles."

23 Barnes, *Eusebius and Constantine* (n. 1 above), 214. Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.11 (SC 477:142–44); Sozom., *HE* 1.10 (GCS 50:22). Not surprisingly, for ideological reasons Eusebius does not mention Paphnutius in his *HE* or *VC*.

24 Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.* 10.4 (PL 21:482): "Constantine thought of him with such respect and affection that many times he called him into the palace, hugged him, and warmly kissed the eye which had been gouged out during his confession of faith."

25 To be sure, Licinius was officially exiled before he was murdered. Yet Constantine started his own career with a reputation for recalling those exiled by Maxentius (see Eusebius, *VC* 1.41 [GCS 57:37]), and he appears to have resisted using exile as a political punishment.

26 Of course, Arius was not a bishop, so his case lies outside the scope of this study.

27 I have used the long list of bishops from Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.8 (SC 477:102).

28 A close reading of Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.9 (SC 477:112–40), and Sozom., *HE* 1.23 (GCS 50:44), casts light on a part of the edict that has been understood to contain the command of banishment.

demonstrates the emperor's will to execute the sentence declared by the bishops. The language in Sozomen's account, however, suggests troubling possibilities and will require some analysis: "He [Constantine] ordered that Eusebius and Theognis leave their sees in exile."<sup>29</sup> In this case, Constantine orders the bishops aligned with Arius to flee the cities they were shepherding.<sup>30</sup> If

It orders Arius's publications to be burned and anyone harboring a copy to be killed, but the extant quotation says nothing of exile. Nor does the document that indicates Arius's restitution several years later mention exile. The only evidence is in a letter from Constantine to the Nicomedians found in Athanasius's *De Decretis Nicaenai Synodi 41* (*Urkunde 27.15* [in Opitz 3:62]): "On this account [that Eusebius had harbored Arius and accomplices] I decided to do this regarding these thankless men: I ordered that they be seized and exiled as far away as possible" (διὸ τοῦτο περὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους τούτους ἔκρινα πρᾶξαι· ἀρπαγέντας γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἐκέλευσα ὡς πορρωτάτῳ ἔξορισθῆναι). Barnes, "Exile of Arius," 125, cites E. Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Berlin, 1959), 3:202–3, for a reconstruction that Arius was not exiled but instead ordered to live in Nicomedia. Schwartz puts more trust in his interpretation of *Urkunde 27.15–16* than in the testimony of Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.10 (in Winkelmann, 11): Λέγει δὲ καὶ Σεκοῦνδον ὑπεροριζόμενον εἰπεῖν πρὸς Εὐσέβιον. "Εὐσέβιε, ὑπέγραψας ἵνα μὴ ἔξορισθῆς, πιστεύω τῷ θεῷ, δι' ἐμοῦ σε δεῖ ἀχθῆσεσθαι ἀπαγόμενον." καὶ γεγονέναι τῷ Εὐσέβιῳ τὸν ἔξοστρακισμὸν μετὰ μῆνας ἀπὸ τῆς συνόδου τρεῖς, καθὰ καὶ Σεκοῦνδος προεῖπεν, πρὸς τὴν ἴδιαν κατὰ τὸ προφανὲς ἀσέβειαν ἀναστρέψαντι. The latter implies that Arius was exiled along with his faithful ally Secundus. Schwartz also cites Philostorgius, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez (Berlin, 1913), 11, where Bidez quotes Niketas Choniates' *Thesaurus Orthodoxae Fidei* to provide the exile's location (Latin translation available in PG 139:1369). The passage is difficult to find in Greek and is worth quoting: οἱ δέ γε περὶ Εὐσέβιον σοφιζόμενοι τὴν βλασφημίαν ἀντὶ τοῦ δικαιουσίου τὸ δικαιουσίου ἐνέγραψαν, πλὴν Σεκοῦνδου καὶ Θεωνᾶ ὃι καὶ εἰς Ἰλλυρίους ἐφυγαδεύθησαν ἀμά Ἀρετῷ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέροις. The editorial neglect of Niketas's immense *Panoplia Dogmatike* (translated into Latin and excerpted in PG 139 as the *Thesaurus*) makes it difficult to assess the credibility of his witness; A. Simpson, *Niketas Choniates: A Historiographical Study* (Oxford, 2013), 36.

29 Sozom., *HE* 1.21 (GCS 50:42): Εὐσέβιον δὲ καὶ Θεόγνιον φεύγειν προσέταξεν ἀς ἐπεσκόπουν πόλεις[.]

30 In the case of Arius, he orders "external exile": δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἀρειον μὲν ὑπερορίω φυγῇ ἔημιώσε· καὶ τοῖς πανταχῇ ἐπισκόποις καὶ λαοῖς νομοθετῶν ἔγραψεν ἀσεβεῖς ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτὸν τε καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ δικόφορονας καὶ πυρὶ παραδίδοντα, εἴ τι αὐτῶν εὑρίσκοιτο σύγγραμμα, ὥστε μήτε αὐτοῦ μήτε τοῦ δόγματος, οὐ εἰσηγήσατο, ὑπόμνημα φέρεσθαι (Sozom., *HE* 1.21 [GCS 50:42]). Was there to be a hierarchy of exiles, with the heresiarch suffering a more severe punishment and thus a greater remove? If so, why not specify Arius's destination? Or is Sozomen anachronistically attributing the policies of Constantius, or more likely of Theodosius, to Constantine, as implied by Van Dam, *The Roman Revolution of Constantine* (n. 2 above), 342? The phrase "external exile" (ὑπερορίος φύγας) first appears in Plato's *Laws*

a distinction is drawn between deposition and banishment, on which side would the treatment of the Arian bishops fall? Could they live in the suburbs of the city, as "Arian" bishops would reside outside Constantinople decades later?<sup>31</sup> Were they forced to live outside the official boundaries of their see? Or were they driven to a region far from their home territory? Surprisingly, the sources are silent.

In fact, in the case of Eusebius of Nicomedia, we have only one explicit testimony that he was banished outside of his jurisdictional territory. A letter from Constantine to the Nicomedians found in Athanasius's *De Decretis Nicaenai Synodi 41* states: "For this reason [that Eusebius had harbored Arius and accomplices in his see of Nicomedia], concerning these ingrates I decided to do this: I ordered that they be captured and exiled as far away as possible."<sup>32</sup> The distinction between ordering and executing will be taken up below, but the letter strongly implies that an edict was disseminated to remove Eusebius and presumably Theognis and Maris from their sees. At the same time, "as far away as possible" hardly sounds like the language of an edict. How would one of Constantine's agents react to such an order? Would he start marching the bishops toward Illyria and stop when "the possible" had been attained? Or had Constantine ordered each of the three to his own exile in destinations on the edge of the empire? And yet, even in the case of Arius himself, Barnes cites Eduard Schwartz's reconstruction that the heresiarch was not exiled but instead ordered to live

855c2, in *Platonis Opera*, ed. J. Burnet, vol. 5 (Oxford, 1907); there, too, it seems strange, since dozens of kinds of exile are discussed, all outside of the convict's πόλις. Sozomen's allusion to Plato may represent nothing more than literary pretension, but the phrase still draws a deliberate distinction between the exile of Arius and that of Eusebius and Theognis.

31 Sozom., *HE* 8.8 (GCS 50:360–61). Theodosius I apparently banned them from worship within the city.

32 Constantine, *Testi costantiniani nelle fonti letterarie*, ed. P. Silli (Milan, 1987), 25; see Athanasius, *Urkunde*, 27.15 (in Opitz 3:62), edited and discussed above, n. 28. The context of the letter could easily be read to support different conclusions: (a) Constantine had not originally exiled the Arians but had requested that they come to his court; (b) those ordered into exile in this letter appear to be not only Eusebius and his allies but also the Arians; (c) if so, then Constantine's order of exile appears not to follow from the Council of Nicaea but rather to be an imperial response to direct disobedience by all bishops involved, both Alexandrian and Nicomedian.

in Nicomedia.<sup>33</sup> Why would Constantine send figures like Maris of Chalcedon off to Armenia while leaving Arius in Nicomedia? Given the lack of evidence, the most prudent conclusion is to admit ignorance: we do not even know if Constantine forced Eusebius, Theognis, and Maris out of their home provinces.

We have only one piece of evidence that Secundus was banished from his home region. Philostorgius states:

As he went into exile Secundus said to Eusebius: “You signed on, Eusebius, so that you would not be sent into exile. I put my faith in God that, through my agency, you will have to be led away and held accountable.” And he did suffer exile three months after the synod just as Secundus predicted, when he turned back to his manifestly individual form of impiety.<sup>34</sup>

Philostorgius’s testimony on this exile strains credulity. We have already seen that Eusebius harbored Arius and his allies in Nicomedia. Were they on their way into exile? Were they being escorted by detachments of soldiers? How could Eusebius’s authority countermand the emperor’s armed agents? Can we make sense of Secundus prophesying to his host, Eusebius, that the tables would soon be turned? Why wouldn’t Constantine’s letter refer to the pardon of Secundus? How far from Nicaea could the exiled bishops be escorted in three months, anyway? Once again, the evidence that Constantine exiled bishops is slim and confusing, and Schwartz appears to be correct in suggesting that all these exiles merely congregated in Nicomedia after Nicaea.

Theodoret also makes a general claim that Constantine exiled Athanasius and, more importantly, offers a strange apology for all the bishops that Constantine exiled: “Let no one be surprised if Constantine, because he was deceived, exiled such great men. For he trusted church leaders who were either hiding their wickedness or, when they were openly corrupt, successfully tricking him.”<sup>35</sup> The bishop-historian goes on to equate Constantine’s sins with those of the

33 Barnes, “Exile of Arius,” 125; Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, 3:202–3.

34 Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.10, cited and discussed above, n. 28.

35 Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.31 (GCS 44:89).

biblical figure David, who was deceived by Ziba into bestowing stolen land (2 Samuel 16)—an unusually inappropriate scriptural example. David himself was in exile from Judah when Ziba, a servant of one of David’s courtiers, helped him return to power. We are left to confront the complexity of Constantine’s legacy for fifth-century church historians, a topic recently approached with care by Raymond Van Dam.<sup>36</sup> Suffice it to say here that the early church historians could not avoid a certain amount of anachronism, often making Constantine into Theodosius I.<sup>37</sup> They also had to navigate their stories between the Scylla of Constantine’s late sympathy toward Arius’s camp and the Charybdis of his enormous prestige as the first Christian emperor, a course that often left their narratives unconvincing.

So Constantine was willing to threaten uncanonical exile and possibly to execute canonical sentences of exile—but was he ready to interfere in ecclesiastic business and order a bishop’s exile on his own imperial authority? An argument against such a policy can be found in the case of Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra.<sup>38</sup> Marcellus rather suddenly came out against what he considered the “Arian” (or Eusebian) faction at the Council of Jerusalem in 335, a position that quickly brought him up against Eusebius of Caesarea.<sup>39</sup> After

36 Van Dam, *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*, 339–42.

37 T. D. Barnes, “The Crimes of Basil of Ancyra,” *JTS* 47, no. 2 (1996): 550–55, argues that Sozomen is a trustworthy source to demonstrate that, for instance, mid-fourth-century bishops were instructing local military officials to execute sentences of exile voted for by synods. I would tend to side with Van Dam’s argument that Sozomen’s depiction of exile almost entirely reflects his fifth-century experiences.

38 This episode is chosen because it was late in Constantine’s reign. For an excellent, detailed discussion of the first sign of his disinclination to exile a bishop (Caecilianus), see Girardet, “Die Petition der Donatisten” (n. 1 above), 186–206. For a full treatment of Marcellus, see S. Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy*, 325–45 (Oxford, 2006).

39 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantine*, 240–42. Recent discussions of Athanasius’s theological opponents have left us without any useful names for the various groups beyond the tendentious “Anomaean,” “Arian,” “Eusebian,” etc.; the less rhetorically encumbered homoousian/homoiousian/heterousian terminology fails to capture the shifting distinctions in factions so important to this study. Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.41 (SC 493:218–22), lists eight groups—a much more complex situation than Athanasians vs. Arians or Nicaeans vs. Eusebians. D. Gwynn, *The Eusebians* (Oxford, 2006), is a good place to start in figuring out how to name the various factions. In this article, I will reluctantly use traditional names such as Eunomian, Eusebian, Nicene, and semi-Arian to distinguish the

unusually harsh diatribes were exchanged, Constantine was forced to call a synod in Constantinople to settle the affair. Unsurprisingly, the group of bishops gathered in the capital found Marcellus to be in heresy and deposed him. At the same meeting Arius complained that Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, would not allow him back into communion, a situation very similar to that of Athanasius when Constantine secretly threatened him with exile. Far from threatening Alexander, Constantine merely ordered that Arius be escorted into Alexander's church to celebrate the liturgy (Arius died on the way). Why would a Constantine who frequently exiled bishops on his own authority suddenly back away from two such obvious troublemakers as Marcellus and Alexander, apparently not even threatening to exile either? My answer is that he had always been careful to avoid the controversy provoked by using his power openly against bishops and that he continued to rely on synods so that troublesome bishops would be canonically deposed.

What of the case of Athanasius's exile in 335? Girardet elaborates a thesis that Constantine made a clear distinction between his duties as emperor responsible for preserving the state and his more vague religious duty as pontifex. This distinction enables us, and ancient authors, to categorize Constantine's exile of Athanasius in 335: the head of state was forced by political necessity to preserve the grain supply from Alexandria to the capital. But it is difficult to ignore the complex circumstances and extant accounts. First, the Council of Tyre had canonically deposed Athanasius, so the emperor, however reluctant, was obliged to follow the precedent of Nicaea and pass an edict exiling Athanasius. We cannot help being confused at Constantine's refusal to do so; instead, according to Athanasius, and despite the clear verdict of Tyre, he called an informal trial at his court in the capital.<sup>40</sup> This action hardly shows Constantine to be a rigid upholder of synodical justice. A second point is that ancient sources do not agree that Athanasius was exiled

various possible groups. The record reveals that our leading bishops had more flexible views than either ancient or modern commentators are comfortable with.

<sup>40</sup> Drake, *Constantine* (n. 5 above), 314–15, reconstructs a group of bishops who chase Athanasius to Constantinople after the Council of Tyre and call his bluff in the presence of Constantine.

for threatening the grain supply; they thus are worth a quick review.<sup>41</sup>

Athanasius himself claimed that Constantine exiled him only to protect him from his enemies, and to support this claim he produced an interesting, though hardly conclusive, letter from Constantine II (Constantius's brother, who was Caesar in the West from 337 to 340).<sup>42</sup> And Socrates appears to deliberately make his narrative ambiguous: "The bishops' testimony won over the emperor's mind and in his anger he suggested exile for Athanasius, requesting that he live in Gaul. Some say that the emperor did this to unify the church, since Athanasius utterly refused communion with the Arians. So Athanasius ended up living in Trier."<sup>43</sup> The nature of this exile remains unclear. It seems unlikely that the emperor could be completely unaware of a threat to the grain supply until *some* bishops from Illyria and Galatia point it out, or even that Constantine would exile the pillar of Nicaea because he threatened the capital's grain supply. Moreover, Socrates seems to recognize the implausibility of his own account when he suggests that Athanasius's exile was intended as an antidote for unrest in Alexandria. Further undercutting the exile narrative, Socrates' dictation strikes the wrong note. Why use such polite language as "suggested exile" (έξορίᾳ ὑποβάλλει) and the vague destination of "Gaul," and why conclude with the mild "so he went and lived in Trier for a while"? Is there a middle course between Socrates' deliberately confusing account and Athanasius's insistence that Constantine sent him to Gaul for his own safety? It has to be conceded that this case shows Constantine exiling a bishop, but its similarity to the exile of the Arian allies (sanctioned by a synod) and the very vagueness of the accounts should make it clear that this is not a very good precedent for Constantius's punitive exiles.

<sup>41</sup> Drake, *Constantine*, 314, reads this "exile" as Constantine's effort to cool off Athanasius.

<sup>42</sup> Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos* 87 (in Opitz 2:166–68).

<sup>43</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.35 (SC 477:246–48): Τούτῳ γὰρ συναρπαγεῖς δὲ βασιλεὺς καὶ εἰς ὄργην ἐκπεσὼν ἔξορίᾳ ὑποβάλλει τὸν Ἀθανάσιον, τὰς Γαλλίας κελεύσας οἰκεῖν. Φασὶ δέ τινες τοῦτο πεποιηκέναι τὸν βασιλέα σκοπῷ τοῦ ἐνωθῆναι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἐπειδὴ Ἀθανάσιος πάντῃ κοινωνήσαι τοῖς περὶ Ἀρειον ἔξετρέπετο. Άλλ' οὐτος μὲν ἐν Τριβέρει τῆς Γαλλίας διῆγεν.

## Innovation Driven by Circumstances: Bishop Paul in Constantinople

Almost from the moment of his father's death in 337, Constantius was met with an episcopal difficulty beyond the sort that Constantine had experienced.<sup>44</sup> The venerable bishop of Constantinople, Alexander, a staunch anti-Arian, died late in the summer and a fractious election established a young presbyter, Paul, as the new bishop.<sup>45</sup> In September of that year Constantius passed through Constantinople while returning from meeting his brothers in Pannonia, and insisted that the election be reversed—a novel tactic in the early development of church-state relations. A newly convoked synod then voted Paul out, and our modern narrative has him sentenced to exile in Pontus.<sup>46</sup>

As it turns out, our sources on the deposition of Paul do not mention banishment, exile, or even direct imperial meddling. Socrates states brusquely, "The emperor arrived at Constantinople and was very angry with the ordination of Paul. He convened an assembly of Arian bishops and retired (*σχολάζειν*) Paul."<sup>47</sup> Despite strongly implying that Constantius rigged the synod to get rid of Paul, Socrates drops no hint that Constantius exercised extraordinary imperial powers or in any way forced exile on the disgraced bishop. Furthermore, he uses the striking term *σχολάζειν*, "to take some time off." Context argues against an ironic euphemism; apparently, Paul was merely relieved of his duties as bishop through a canonically appropriate measure. In this case, Constantius avoided any suggestion of forceful or direct intervention.

Sozomen, after altering some of Socrates' details and adding a good deal of his own editorial vision,

<sup>44</sup> Wirbelau, "Exil für den römischen Bischof?" (n. 1 above), 32–46, following Girardet, brings up the precedent of Constantine's adjudicating between Caecilianus and Donatus, the feuding bishops of Carthage, in 313—a good example of calling a sort of local juridical synod to advise the emperor. But the case did not produce a verdict of exile, even though an efficient, distant, and permanent exile of Donatus might have saved Constantine and following emperors trouble.

<sup>45</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 212.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 214.

<sup>47</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.7 (SC 493:34): *Μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἐπιστὰς δὲ βασιλεὺς τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει πρὸς ὄργην ἐκκαίεται ἐπὶ τῇ γενομένῃ χειροτονίᾳ. Καὶ καθίσας συνέδριον τῶν τὰ Ἀρείου φρονούντων ἐπισκόπων τὸν μὲν Παύλον σχολάζειν ἐποίησεν[.]*

returns to his model's example: "When the emperor was present in Constantinople again, after the ordination of Paul (for he was absent when it happened), he was angry that an unworthy man had been elevated to bishop. He called a synod according to the plan of Paul's enemies and drove him from the church."<sup>48</sup> Once again, though Sozomen uses a stronger word, *ἀπωθεῖν*—one much more closely tied to traditional exile language—his text denies that Constantius intervened directly and that Paul was in any way physically exiled. The last section does recall early Christian shunning and excommunication, but the overall effect is similar to that of Socrates' version. Paul was stripped of his duties as bishop, and presumably Alexander's faction continued to honor him (as the accounts discussed below will indicate).

Our only source implicating an emperor in the exile of Paul is Athanasius. In his *History of the Arians*, an almost satirical exaggeration of Constantius's transgressions against the church, Athanasius states that he was present when the party of Macedonius made accusations against Paul and that Constantius accepted these and exiled Paul to Pontus.<sup>49</sup> We are left to wonder why Socrates and Sozomen, writers sympathetic to Paul's plight and hostile to Constantius's theology and politics, chose not to mention that act. I suspect that Athanasius conflated Paul's deposition in 337 with Constantius's unambiguous imperial exiles later, or, equally as likely, his strong rhetorical purpose in the history drove him to embellish the narrative. In any event, we have no evidence that Paul ever went to Pontus, and, as we will see, the second exile sentence was largely ignored. But this second exile will stand out as critical in our short history of Constantius's policy.

However exaggerated Athanasius's account may have been, it is clear that Paul and his supporters

<sup>48</sup> Sozom., *HE* 3.4 (GCS 50:105): *μετὰ δὲ τὴν Παύλου χειροτονίαν παραγενόμενος δὲ βασιλεὺς—έτυχε γάρ τότε ἀπόδημος—έχαλέπαινεν ὡς ἀναξίω τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐπιτραπείσης, ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς τε τῶν πρὸς Παύλον ἀπεχθανομένων σύνοδον καθίσας, τὸν μὲν ἀπεώσατο τῆς ἐκκλησίας.*

<sup>49</sup> Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum* 7 (in Opitz 2:186): *ἔμεινεν ἡ πρόφασις κατὰ Παύλου, καὶ οὐκ ἡμέλησαν τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς, ἀλλ' ἔμειναν διαβάλλοντες, καὶ τὸ μὲν πρώτον εἰς τὸν Πόντον ἐξωρίσθη ὑπὸ Κωνσταντίου, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον παρὰ Κωνσταντίου, δεθεὶς ἀλύσεσι σιδηραῖς, εἰς Σίγγαρα τῆς Μεσοποταμίας ἐξωρίσθη, εἰτα ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὴν Ἐμισαν μετηνέχθη, καὶ τὸ τέταρτον εἰς Κούκουσον τῆς Καππαδοκίας περὶ τὰ ἔρημα τοῦ Ταύρου, ἔνθα καὶ, ὡς οἱ συνόντες ἀπήγγειλαν, ἀποπνιγεῖς παρ' αὐτῶν ἐτελεύτησε.*

were ready to act late in 341 when they rushed him back to be elected bishop. Meanwhile, the other faction elected Macedonius and violence ensued.<sup>50</sup> Constantius was tuned in to events all the way from Antioch and rerouted his general Hermogenes to depose Paul for a second time. Presumably his decision to send a general accompanied by soldiers was not intended to produce a repeated canonical vote in the synod. The citizens of Constantinople then lynched Hermogenes, causing Constantius to travel quickly from Antioch. Upon his arrival the emperor punished the city, and, all our sources agree, exiled Paul, though Socrates and Sozomen do not specify a destination; only Athanasius gives it as Mesopotamia.<sup>51</sup> We can hardly begin to imagine the panic that the lynching of Hermogenes caused Constantius's court in Antioch.<sup>52</sup> The best indication of its intensity is that Constantius dropped preparations for his campaign against Persia and rode from the Levant to the capital. Somehow he managed to accomplish this between the time of the insurrection, possibly as late as January 342, and the end of March, when he was back in Antioch.<sup>53</sup> But Paul did not obediently travel east to Mesopotamia, if that was indeed ever his assigned destination, and Constantius would come to regret this hasty attempt at exile.<sup>54</sup>

The story of Paul and fellow exiled bishops gathering in Trier and later enjoying the hospitality of the bishop of Rome has been well told by Barnes.<sup>55</sup> Paul and his friend Maximinus, bishop of Trier, won the ear of Constans and convinced him to support the cause of eastern bishops exiled in the West. Constans then met with Athanasius in Milan and arranged for the Council of Serdica to provide an opportunity for him to throw his imperial support behind the displaced Nicene bishops in his domain. This news and the showdown likely at Serdica could hardly have pleased

50 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 213; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.12 (SC 493:50–52); Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos* 21–35 (in Opitz 2:102–13).

51 Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.13 (SC 493:52–54); Sozom., *HE* 3.7 (GCS 50:107); Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 7 (in Opitz 2:186).

52 Libanius, *Oration* 59, in *Opera*, ed. R. Foerster (Leipzig, 1908), 4:256–57.

53 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 219–20; *CTh* 3.12.

54 The detail that Paul was escorted bound in chains stands out as Athanasius's greatest embellishment (*Hist. Ar.* 7 [in Opitz 2:186]).

55 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 63–70.

Constantius, who had hoped to have rid himself of the gadflies of his two most important sees, Alexandria and Constantinople. His displeasure must surely have driven him to ponder a new strategy for dealing with recalcitrant bishops. Presumably he continued to see value in exiling people like Paul; more importantly, he recognized the importance of ensuring that future exiles could not run to the sees of friendly bishops or to the courts of friendly Augusti.

The Council of Serdica, which resolved few issues,<sup>56</sup> served to unite a group of bishops in the West: the deposed easterners Athanasius, Paul, Marcellus of Ancyra, Asclepas of Gaza, and Lucius of Adrianople, along with Julius, bishop of Rome, Hosius of Corduba, and various other western bishops sympathetic to their exiled colleagues and openly hostile to the theological stance of the eastern bishops. Various embassies were sent eastward to attempt to relocate the exiled bishops, but all failed; Lucius's reentry into Adrianople ended in his death, most likely at the hands of Constantius's officials.<sup>57</sup> Paul was ejected from Constantinople again, this time by a crafty stratagem of the emperor's praetorian prefect, Philippus.<sup>58</sup> Though Athanasius and Socrates disagree on the destination of his exile, the record is clear that soon thereafter Paul ended up in Italy, whence he could stage his return yet again.<sup>59</sup> Not long after that Athanasius was able to return to his see in Alexandria following an unlikely sequence of events: Constans's success in threatening violence

56 Rapp, *Holy Bishops* (n. 5 above), 254, discusses canon 8 of the Council of Serdica. She points out its intent to regulate the number of bishops visiting the imperial court by requiring that bishops could make such a visit only with the emperor's invitation. Surely the court wished to control the constant flow of bishops, but, as Rapp notes, the canon was not enforced: indeed, as this article demonstrates, bishops freely flowed to the court in a constant stream. She also discusses the details of travel cost and hospitality (265–66).

57 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 84. Murder of, and murder threats toward, bishops will not be discussed here, though killing could be seen as simply a more sudden and permanent form of exile.

58 Ibid., 214. Note that Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.16 (SC 493:62), states that Paul was banished to Thessalonike, while Athanasius's enthusiastic passage from *Historia Arianorum* 7 (in Opitz 2:186) has the third exile to Emesa in Syria.

59 See previous note. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 215–16, emends Athanasius's text to mean that Paul went to the court of Constantius in Emesa in his fourth exile; from there he was sent to Cucusus in Armenia, where he was reportedly strangled.

against his brother and the death of Gregory, standing bishop of Alexandria, in June of 345.<sup>60</sup> Constantius, acting against the Council of Tyre's canonical conviction, restored Athanasius to his see, where, in Barnes's well-chosen words, "his triumphant progress into Alexandria resembled less the return of an exiled bishop than the *adventus* of a Roman emperor."<sup>61</sup>

News of this glorious return must have reached a pensive Constantius. So far his attempts to pacify his realm had involved considerable exertion, not least his rushed journey to Constantinople in the winter of 343, and yet the deposed bishops continued to gather in Aquileia to conspire their return. If his goal had been to dump them on his younger brother Constans, he had failed, and the exiled bishops had pushed his fraternal colleague to threats of civil war—hardly a peaceful outcome. In short, he had expended a good deal of political capital and personal effort in order to remove divisive bishops from his realm, only to be left with a situation more divisive than riots in major cities or whatever his worst fears were. He was staring a civil war in the face, and thus he humbly allowed Athanasius's long and glorious march through the Levant back to an exultant flock in Alexandria. Constantius must have been mulling a plan to place exiles more carefully in the future. And the record leaves us little doubt that by the time of this turn of events in 345, Constantius's earlier tolerance of Athanasius as a misguided fanatic must have shifted over to hostility toward a competitor.<sup>62</sup>

### A First Politically Successful Exile: Paulinus of Trier

For the next eight years, from 345 to 353, the bishops for the most part kept out of Constantius's way and peace was maintained. Certainly a significant cause of the détente was Athanasius's happy return to Alexandria, which, in a sense, was the most successful destination for exiling that bishop. Meanwhile

60 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 90.

61 Ibid., 92.

62 Negotiations between Magnentius and Athanasius would certainly have underscored the competition between the emperor and his main ecclesiastic enemy. C. Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity* (Baltimore, 1997), 461 n. 10, cites Zosimus 2.51–52, *Epitome de Caesaribus* 42.4–8, and Eutropius 10.12 in his discussion of Alexandrian unrest in the 350s.

Magnentius's murder of Constans in 350 closed the alienated bishops' haven in the West, and Constantius was forced to avenge his brother's death (a campaign that would not conclude until the Battle of Mons Seleucus in 353).<sup>63</sup> Not coincidentally, at the war's conclusion in 353, Paulinus of Trier, the host and defender of Athanasius, was voted into exile by the Council of Arles, at the instigation of Constantius.<sup>64</sup> This time the destination was specified as Phrygia. Though the Phrygian metropoleis of Laodicea and Synnada boasted ancient roots and quite possibly Nicene-leaning bishops,<sup>65</sup> Constantius carefully placed Paulinus in a location far from any hope of the Roman bishop's aid and encircled by loyal eastern bishops in other major cities. With heated rhetoric, Hilary of Poitiers even suggests that Constantius deliberately intended to place Paulinus "beyond the very name of 'Christian,'" where he would die far from sacramental comforts.<sup>66</sup> The tactic was effective: Paulinus died in exile without causing any further disruption.<sup>67</sup> Though we have no details of how Paulinus was escorted into the hinterland or how he was constrained there, accounts agree that he died in Phrygia, whence his remains were translated back to the cathedral in Trier in 361.<sup>68</sup>

63 S. Gentili, "Politics and Christianity in Aquileia in the Fourth Century A.D.," *AntCl* 61 (1992): 192–208, supplies interesting insights on the conflict from the perspective of the localities.

64 Girardet, "L'édit d'Arles" (n. 1 above), 63–91, carefully attempts to reconstruct the edict issued after the Council of Arles.

65 Suda, s.v. "Agapetos," praises Agapetos, bishop of Synnada, and comments on Eusebius of Caesarea's great admiration for his miracles. Agapetos may have been seen as loyal to the court of Constantine and thus trustworthy as a host of exiled bishops.

66 Hilary of Poitiers, *Contra Constantium* 11, in *Contre Constance*, ed. A. Rocher (Paris, 1987), 190. See H. Crouzel, "Un résistant toulousain à la politique pro-arienne de l'empereur Constance II: L'évêque Rhodanius," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 77 (1976): 173–90, at 180–81; C. Beckwith, "The Condemnation and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers at the Synod of Béziers (356 CE)," *JECchrSt* 13.1 (2005): 21–38, at 27–28; Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica* 2.39, in *Chroniques*, ed. G. de Senneville-Grave (Paris, 1999), 314.

67 Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica* 2.45 (in de Senneville-Grave, 330–32).

68 M. Fiedrowicz, "Paulinus von Trier—ein frühchristlicher Bekennerbischof im Spannungsfeld von Kirche und Staat," *TIBZ* 119.2 (2010): 149–64, provides a fitting epitaph for this heroic bishop.

## A Western Purge: Dionysius of Milan, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Lucifer of Cagliari

Two events followed in 355 that would sufficiently stoke the hearth for forging a mature policy: the Council of Milan in midsummer and the elevation in November of the emperor's cousin Julian, an unlikely ally in the mold of Constans for exiled bishops in the West.<sup>69</sup> During this time, the emperor successfully employed a new tactic, as Barnes notes:

Constantius now combined these two precedents [of Constantine: sending out the results of Nicaea for some bishops to sign individually and then presenting the signed document to other synods to sign]. In a process which lasted several years, officials took copies of the Sirmian decisions, as subscribed at Arles, and subsequently at Milan, to individual bishops in Italy, and then in Gaul, Spain, and Britain, and compelled them to add their names under the threat of exile.<sup>70</sup>

The “threat of exile” can be confirmed only by a controversial letter of Liberius, by Athanasius’s own rhetoric, and by Sulpicius Severus’s narrative,<sup>71</sup> but Constantius undoubtedly brought to bear some strong form of persuasion on the reluctant western bishops; and as we have seen, the threat of uncanonical exile was also wielded by Constantine. However this may have been done, during the Council of Milan itself Constantius applied political pressure in an effort to drive Athanasius out of Alexandria.<sup>72</sup> Then, in the aftermath of Milan,

69 Amm. Marc. 15.7 cleverly juxtaposes Constantius’s heavy-handed treatment of Liberius, bishop of Rome, with the elevation of Julian.

70 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 116.

71 Scholars as diverse as Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 116, and Crouzel, “Résistant toulousain,” 184–85, who discuss Liberius and Athanasius, accept Severus’s comment: *igitur cum sententiam eorum, quam de Athanasio dederant, nostri non reciperen, edictum ab imperatore proponitur, ut qui in damnationem Athanasii non subscriberent, in exsilium pellerentur* (*Chronica* 2.39 [in de Senneville-Grave, 314]). Directly preceding this episode, Severus tells the story of how Valens of Mursa fooled Constantius into thinking that his victory over Magnentius was due to his holiness: *facilis ad credendum imperator palam postea dicere solitus, se Valentis meritis, non virtute exercitus viciisse* (*Chronica* 2.39 [in de Senneville-Grave, 314]).

72 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 118–19.

Constantius exiled those who had defended Athanasius publicly: Dionysius of Milan, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Lucifer of Cagliari. These exiles, all implicated in Constantius’s central goal of banishing Athanasius, would signal the first intensive phase of his strategy for exiling troublesome bishops. It should be noted that the emperor gradually and carefully drove the popular Athanasius out of Alexandria using only political agents, while he very directly and forcefully removed Athanasius’s western supporters to destinations that would spare him the problems that had arisen earlier in connection with Paul and Athanasius.<sup>73</sup>

Dionysius of Milan was exiled for refusing to sign the condemnation of Athanasius presented at the Council of Milan.<sup>74</sup> The sources do not entirely agree on the details,<sup>75</sup> but according to Hilary, writing shortly thereafter, Lucifer of Cagliari proposed that all present should sign to demonstrate their loyalty to the Council of Nicaea. The document came first to Dionysius, but while he was signing it, Valens of Mursa tore the paper and pen from his hands.<sup>76</sup> Whatever may have actually happened, there is no doubt that Dionysius was exiled.<sup>77</sup> How he was exiled creates more confusion. Athanasius, and Theodoret following him, attests that Constantius was present at the council and personally exiled Dionysius:

73 Ibid., 118–20.

74 Crouzel, “Résistant toulousain,” 175–76.

75 Ibid., 178, sorts out Socrates’ and Sozomen’s assertion that Dionysius’s see was Alba.

76 Hilary of Poitiers, *ad Constantium Imperatorem* 8 (PL 10:562): *Conventus ut in Athanasium subscriberet, ait, De sacerdotali fide prius debere constare; compertos sibi quosdam ex his qui adessent, haeretica labe pollutos. Expositam fidem apud Nicaeam, cuius superius meminimus, posuit in medio: spondens omnia se, quae postularent esse facturum, si fidei professionem scripsissent. Dionysius Mediolanensis Episcopus chartam primus accepit: ubi profiteri scribendo coepit, Valens calatum et chartam e manibus eius violenter extorsit, clamans non posse fieri, ut aliquid inde gereretur. Res post clamorem multum deducta in conscientiam plebis est: gravis omnium dolor ortus est, impugnata est a sacerdotibus fides. Verentes igitur illi populi iudicium, e Dominico ad palatium transeunt. cuiusmodi sententiam in Eusebium longe ante quam ecclesiam ingredieretur scripserint: de se loquitur ipsa sententia* (end of the letter).

77 Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium* 27, in *Athanasius Werke: Zweiter Band “die Apologien,”* ed. H. C. Brennecke, U. Heil, and A. von Stockhausen (Berlin, 2006), 301; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.12 (GCS 44:66).

... noble bishops, Paulinus of Trier, the metropolis of the Gauls; Lucifer, bishop of the metropolis of Sardinia; Eusebius of Vercelli in Italy; and Dionysius of Milan, the metropolis of Italy. The emperor called these in and ordered them to subscribe against Athanasius and thus join into communion with the heretics. And when they were shocked by this innovation and said that there was no canon, he answered immediately, "Whatever I prefer, let this be considered a canon. The so-called Syrian bishops uphold me speaking like this. Either obey or you too will be exiles."<sup>78</sup>

Athanasius casts doubt on his narrative's accuracy by including Paulinus, who, as we have seen above, had been exiled in 353 (two years earlier), following the Council of Arles. Theodoret adds, "They told the emperor to his face what he had ordered was unjust and impious. For this act of courage they were expelled (ἐξελαύνειν) from the church, and condemned to live on the farthest boundaries of the empire."<sup>79</sup> This account, too, compromises itself: it misquotes Athanasius's *History of the Arians* while misidentifying the source as his *Apology to Constantius*. Most strongly undercutting the case that Constantius made tyrannical speeches to the faces of these heroic bishops is the testimony of Sulpicius Severus. While Severus attests that Constantius was in Milan (which he almost certainly was), he adds that Dionysius was prepared to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, once they had discussed the theological issues surrounding the case. After Valens and Ursacius withdrew in fear from the council

78 Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 33 (in Opitz 2:201–2): ἐπίσκοποι ἀγαθοί, Παυλίνος ὁ ἀπὸ Τριβέρων τῆς μητροπόλεως τῶν Γαλλίων ἐπίσκοπος καὶ Λουκίφερ ὁ ἀπὸ μητροπόλεως τῆς Σερδινίας ἐπίσκοπος Εὐσέβιος τε ὁ ἀπὸ Βερκέλλων τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ ἀπὸ Μεδιολάνων, ἔστι δὲ καὶ αὕτη μητρόπολις τῆς Ἰταλίας. τούτους γὰρ βασιλεὺς καλέσας ἐκέλευσε κατὰ Ἀθανασίου μὲν ὑπογράφειν, τοῖς δὲ αἱρετικοῖς κοινωνεῖν. εἰτα ἐκείνων θαυμαζόντων τὸ καινὸν ἐπιτήδευμα τοῦτο καὶ λεγόντων, μὴ εἶναι τούτον ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα, εὐθὺς ἐκείνος· ἀλλ ὅπερ ἐγώ βούλομαι, τοῦτο κανών, ἔλεγε. 'νομιζέσθω· οὕτω γάρ μου λέγοντος ἀνέχονται οἱ τῆς Συρίας λεγόμενοι ἐπίσκοποι. ἡ τοίνυν πείσθητε ἡ καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπερόριοι γενήσεσθε.'

79 Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.12 (GCS 44:128): ἀντικρυς παρόντα τὸν βασιλέα διελέγχαντες ὡς ἀδικα παρεγγυῶντα καὶ δυστεβῆ, καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐξηλάθησαν καὶ τὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐσχατιὰς οἰκεῖν κατεκρίθησαν. καὶ τοῦτο δὲ πάλιν Ἀθανάσιος δὲ θαυμάσιος ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ Ἀπολογίᾳ συγγέγραφε.

into the palace, they found themselves in a difficult situation: the rumor had gotten around Milan that they had refused to sign the formula of the Council of Nicaea, angering the pious people. Sulpicius tells us how the conspirators contrived to prevail:

They [Valens and Ursacius and their colleagues] sent a letter corrupted with every wickedness under the name of the emperor, surely thinking that if the people received it obediently, they could carry on with the official authority they desired. But if it were received otherwise, all the popular displeasure would be directed toward the emperor. . . . And so when the letter was read in church the people were averted. Dionysius was driven from the city, since he had not agreed to sign, and Auxentius was substituted as bishop in his place.<sup>80</sup>

If we accept Severus's version, then we cannot reconstruct Constantius's direct order of Dionysius's exile. Whom should we believe, Athanasius or Severus? Severus's more convincing narrative, his basic agreement with Hilary, and his proximity to western sources inspire confidence. Certainly Constantius's presence looms behind the Council of Milan,<sup>81</sup> and we should believe that Dionysius was exiled according to his plan: Constantius needed this bishop far from his power base. But, as in his approach to Paulinus, the emperor

80 Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica* 2.39 (in de Senneville-Grave, 314): *illinc epistolam sub imperatoris nomine mittunt, omni pravitate infectam, eo nimis consilio, ut, si eam aequis auribus populus receperisset, publica auctoritate cupita proferrent; sin aliter fuisse excepta, omnis invidia esset in rege, et ipsa venialis [quia etiam tum catechumenus sacramentum fidei merito videretur potuisse nescire]. igitur lecta in ecclesia epistola populus aversatus. Dionysius, quia non esset assensus, urbe pellitur, statimque eius in locum Auxentius episcopus subrogatur.*

81 Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.37 (SC 493:162): "When the emperor learned [what had happened at Milan], he used exile to get rid of these bishops [Paulinus, Eusebius, and Dionysius]" (Γνως δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς μὲν ἐκποδῶν δὲ ἐξορίας ποιεῖ). Sozom., *HE* 4.9 (GCS 50:148): "These [Dionysius, Eusebius, Paulinus, Rhodanus, and Lucifer] were convicted to exile for speaking so directly, and Hilary along with them" (οἱ μὲν ὀδει παρρησιασάμενοι ὑπερορίω φυγῇ κατεδικάσθησαν, σὺν τούτοις δὲ καὶ Ἰλάριος). These eastern historians writing in the 5th century seem to have compressed Athanasius's writings, thus leaving us a muddled narrative of councils from Arles to Constantinople. Hilary of Poitiers, *Contra Constantium* 2.3–6 (in Rocher, 170), clearly places Dionysius in the post-Milan exile group.

had no need for personal intervention and could allow the staged synod to do his work.<sup>82</sup>

Closely connected to Dionysius's exile in some sources, Eusebius of Vercelli enters the ranks of exiled bishops as the most thoroughly studied outside of Athanasius and Hilary.<sup>83</sup> Though his banishment, like that of Dionysius, stems from a stand against Ursacius, Valens, and the eastern bishops at Milan, his exile and return attract greater interest. Not only do sources agree that he was exiled to Scythopolis but several of his letters from this exile are extant. As Washburn has argued recently, Constantius carefully chose this destination in the same spirit in which he selected Phrygia for Paulinus.<sup>84</sup> Scythopolis was proud of its Hellenic reputation, while at the same time its local bishop, Patrophilus, maintained a long-standing and firm stance against Athanasius and his western allies. Add the remoteness of the region surrounding Scythopolis, and Constantius's newfound wisdom in exiling becomes clear.<sup>85</sup> Eusebius's letters complaining about harsh treatment from the local bishop provide further evidence. Washburn convincingly draws on these letters to describe the stance as successful dissident that Eusebius was able to establish in Patrophilus's small see, and thus provides vivid insight into the life of an exiled bishop. Far from suffering in silence and alone, Eusebius imported alms from his flock back in Italy and used them to generously spread charity among the Scythopolitans. Though Constantius had found a successful strategy to neutralize bishops through exile, it seems unlikely that the emperor ever underestimated the pertinacity and resourcefulness of these powerful figures.

Lucifer of Cagliari, who has not received the same level of attention as Eusebius, also was condemned at

82 E. Speller, "A Note on Eusebius of Vercelli and the Council of Milan," *JTS* 36 (1985): 157–65, draws on details in the sermons of pseudo-Maximus of Turin to formulate a sharper picture of the mystery surrounding Dionysius's role at the Council of Milan.

83 L. Dattrino, "Eusebio di Vercelli, vescovo, monaco, martire," *Salesianum* 72 (2010): 699–720.

84 D. Washburn, "Tormenting the Tormentors: A Reinterpretation of Eusebius of Vercelli's Letter from Scythopolis," *ChHist* 78.4 (2009): 731–55.

85 Amm. Marc. 19.12.8 remarks on its convenient remoteness. Washburn, "Tormenting the Tormentors," 733, conflates the chronology a bit, as he connects Eusebius's exile to Ammianus's description of Constantius's horrifying treason trials held in Scythopolis in 359—quite possibly after Eusebius had escaped to Egypt.

the Council of Milan for supporting Athanasius and for not signing the condemnation of him.<sup>86</sup> Lucifer had been sent by Liberius to head the delegation to Constantius delivering the pope's request for the Council of Milan. Along the way this delegation picked up our Eusebius of Vercelli, a native of Sardinia; thus began an alliance that would end in discord. Lucifer's extant writings tell us that he was exiled first to Germanicia, in the foothills of the eastern slope of the Taurus mountains, and then to Eleutheropolis in Palestine, south of Jerusalem.<sup>87</sup> Like Eusebius's exile, each location chosen was overseen by a stridently opposed bishop: Eudoxius in Germanicia and Eutychius in Eleutheropolis.<sup>88</sup> Lucifer needed to be relocated because Eudoxius took on various functions within Constantius's court during the 350s and was not available in his home see as a guard and reeducator.<sup>89</sup> The exiles of the group purged at the Council of Milan—Dionysius, Eusebius, and Lucifer—therefore all followed the pattern of Constantius's successful banishment of Paulinus, though they were not as successful despite the care given to the removals and destinations. The challenge for the emperor and his court had hardly been overcome.

### New Approaches to Eliminating Political Enemies: Liberius of Rome, Hilary of Poitiers, Hosius of Corduba

The case of Liberius, bishop of Rome, illustrates several new wrinkles in Constantian policy. Though the chronology of his exile has not been completely agreed upon, we have a solid account in Ammianus, an author seldom interested in ecclesiastical politics. Liberius had refused to attend the Council of Arles and Milan and had held firm in not signing a condemnation

86 W. Tietze, *Lucifer von Calaris und die Kirchenpolitik des Constantius II.* (Tübingen, 1976).

87 Editorial summary, PL 13:744. Tietze, *Lucifer von Calaris*, 61–66.

88 Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.37 (SC 493:162–64), describes Eudoxius's maneuvering to become the Eusebian bishop of Germanicia; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 3.302 (in Holl [n. 9 above], 3:302), describes the anti-Athanasian bent of Eutychius.

89 Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.19 (SC 493:72): Eudoxius delivers the Eusebian creed to Milan in 355; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.37 (SC 493:162–64): he asks Constantius to grant him leave from the court to tend to affairs in Germanicia around the beginning of 358.

of Athanasius. For this reason, Ammianus tells us, Constantius had the urban prefect of Rome, Leontius, arrest him and bring him to the court in Milan.<sup>90</sup> Theodoret picks up the tale with a flourish, presenting a contentious dialogue between the Roman bishop and the emperor, along with provocative interjections from the eunuch courtier Eusebius and Epictetus, the bishop of Centumcellae.<sup>91</sup> The discussion resulted in an ultimatum for Liberius: sign his assent to the condemnation of Athanasius or go into exile. Interestingly, Theodoret has Constantius allow Liberius to choose his place of exile (though this seems very unlikely), and Liberius ends up in Thracian Beroea. Also, the eastern historian has both Constantius and his wife separately offer Liberius 500 gold pieces for “expenses” (πεντακοσίους δλοκοτίνους εις δαπάνας). More bribes are offered, but Liberius holds fast and demands that the money go to the emperor’s troops. More curious is his desire that if the troops are not paid, the money should go to his ecclesiastical “enemies” Epictetus and Auxentius, Dionysius’s successor in Milan.

A good deal of evidence exists that undercuts this heroic depiction. In several of Liberius’s surviving letters, the bishop’s resolve seems far less firm. Given the discussion above, it is not surprising that he was sent to Demophilus, bishop of Beroea, a Eusebian partisan who would play a role in later synods. According to the exile script pioneered by Eusebius of Vercelli, we should expect open strife and persistent undercutting of the local bishop’s authority. Instead we have Liberius admitting in his letter that he has been persuaded by Demophilus that Athanasius deserved his punishment and that the Eusebian formula is orthodox.<sup>92</sup> Once again the chronology is fuzzy, but I tend to follow Barnes’s reading of the sources, which places Liberius’s exile in 355—right after the post-Milan condemnations of Dionysius, Eusebius, and Lucifer and right before the elevation of Constantius’s cousin Julian to the purple in November.<sup>93</sup> If this is correct, then Hanns Christof Brennecke’s view of Constantius’s strategy for exiling Liberius is wrong, for Brennecke presupposes a date of

356: he argues that George’s accession to the bishopric of Alexandria on 15 June 356 and the exile of Hilary after the Council of Biterrae in the spring of 356 forced Constantius to the unusual “Nacht- und Nebelaktion” enacted by Leontius against Liberius.<sup>94</sup> More likely the exile occurred in autumn 355 and was part of an orchestrated purge of western Athanasius-defenders planned around the Synod of Milan, as we have seen above.<sup>95</sup> At any rate, Liberius’s change of opinion opened the door for him to return to his see in Rome along with the emperor in the spring of 357. The first exile-as-correction episode had succeeded, and Liberius again became bishop of Rome, replacing Felix, who resumed his old position as Liberius’s deacon.

Athanasius unsurprisingly presented a tendentious account of these events in his *History of the Arians*.<sup>96</sup> Though the theological rift between Nicaeans and Arians dominated the work, Constantius was depicted as maniacally bent on rooting out all Nicene opposition as Liberius heroically resisted. In fact, Athanasius supplies a speech of Liberius to Constantius that scarcely agrees with Theodoret’s dialogue or the unlikely “lapse” that Liberius suffers two years later.<sup>97</sup> Recent scholarship has clarified Liberius’s motives in opposing Constantius: they were rooted more in a desire to protect ecclesiastical discipline and especially his own perceived privileges as bishop of Rome than in theological differences with the Eusebian party.<sup>98</sup> He stubbornly resisted the efforts of eastern bishops to convict colleagues while the accused were absent, as had happened with Athanasius at the Council of Tyre. No doubt Liberius also felt the need to resist the emperor’s meddling in what he considered his domain, but his extant letters demonstrate few theological differences with either the Eusebians or the emperor. At the same time, Constantius’s strategy for exiling these bishops also becomes more clear. Had the emperor yearned only for theological unity, he

94 Brennecke, *Hilarius* (n. 2 above), 266–69. For an overview of issues at Biterrae, see also L. M. Mirri, “Riferimenti patristici nei concili del sec. IV in Gallia,” *AnnHistCon* 35 (2003): 186–99.

95 Crouzel, “Résistant toulousain” (n. 66 above), 182.

96 Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 34–41 (in Opitz 2:202–6).

97 Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 41 (in Opitz 2:206): ὁ δὲ Λιβέριος ἔξορισθεὶς ὑστερον μετὰ διετῆ χρόνον ὥκλασε καὶ φοβηθεὶς τὸν ἀπειλούμενον θάνατον ὑπέγραψεν. ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο δείκνυσιν ἐκείνων μὲν τὴν βίαν, Λιβερίου δὲ τὸ κατὰ τῆς αἰρέσεως μίσος καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ Αθανασίου ψῆφον, ὅτε τὴν προαιρέσιν εἶχεν ἐλευθέραν.

98 Brennecke, *Hilarius*, 268.

90 Amm. Marc. 15.7.

91 Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.13 (GCS 44:134–36).

92 Corroborated by Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.3 (in Winkelmann [n. 19 above], 60). See Liberius, *Epistola ad Orientales* (PL 8:1365–67).

93 T. D. Barnes, “The Capitulation of Liberius and Hilary of Poitiers,” *Phoenix* 46.3 (1992): 256–65.

would not have replaced Liberius with his loyal deacon Felix. Far more central to Constantius's design was the wish to silence Athanasius's defenders, whatever the reason for their defense, at this delicate time when he was carefully driving his adversary from Alexandria. It would not be an overstatement to assert that by 355, Constantius had come to see Athanasius as his most powerful enemy and to believe that Athanasius's removal from authority required the banishment of his powerful colleagues as well.<sup>99</sup>

Several more allies of Athanasius remained, one of whom is often called "the Athanasius of the West"—Hilary of Poitiers.<sup>100</sup> The motives for Hilary's resistance to Constantius have been thoroughly discussed, and no clear consensus has been reached.<sup>101</sup> But for the purposes of this study, what matters more are the details of his exile and how this exile fit into Constantius's strategy. No one contests that Hilary, along with his colleague Rhodanius of Toulouse, was exiled after the Council of Biterrae. Barnes has convincingly argued that this council must have concluded before the end of May 356, and Henri Crouzel has shown that most likely Hilary's condemnation came from the bishops of Gallia Narbonensis acting in accord with Saturninus of Arles as well as their Illyrian colleagues Ursacius of Singidunum and Valens of Mursa.<sup>102</sup> Constantius had attempted to clear out western dissident bishops at the Council of Milan, but the low attendance and unexpected turn of events initiated by Valens and Ursacius's disruption left several important bishops still in their sees. So we can assume that Constantius's strategy was to track down Hilary and his allies at one of Gaul's biannual provincial synods, which would be more difficult to avoid than was the extraordinary Council of Milan. As we have seen, this maneuver also enabled him to have Hilary exiled canonically by his

99 Sozom., *HE* 4.15 (GCS 50:158): "The bishops convened at Sirmium wrote . . . whatever illegalities might have occurred in the ordination of Felix, or the banishment of Liberius, can be buried in oblivion." See note 62 above on Athanasius's flirtation with Magnentius.

100 For Hilary as the "Athanasius of the West," see T. D. Barnes, "Hilary of Poitiers on His Exile," *VChr* 46 (1992): 129–40, at 138 n. 3.

101 C. Beckwith, *Hilary of Poitiers on the Trinity* (Oxford, 2008), summarizes the history of the discussion and argues for a Christian motive.

102 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius* (n. 1 above), 141; Crouzel, "Résistant toulousain."

colleagues. We are not surprised that Hilary was sent to Phrygia, where Paulinus and Dionysius had preceded him and where presumably, as Hilary said, all would be "beyond the very name of 'Christian.'" But while Paulinus and Dionysius would die in exile without leaving words behind, Hilary continued to express his written dissent.<sup>103</sup> Although there is little hope that we will recover the difference between Hilary's conditions of exile and those of Paulinus and Dionysius, we can hardly avoid speculating that Hilary ended up in a less isolated location and somehow maintained open lines of communications.<sup>104</sup> Constantius followed his Paulinus script yet again, with only a small innovation on the synod needed to convict him, though, like Eusebius of Vercelli before him, Hilary was able to maintain a dissident stance in exile.

The last hero of opposition to Constantius, Hosius, bishop of Corduba, seems to have been overlooked in earlier discussions of Constantian strategy. In his narrative Athanasius ties Hosius's exile closely to the case of Liberius, almost pairing the two stories of heroic resistance and eventual capitulation to threats of violence. But Hosius's "exile" appears unique as well as somewhat exaggerated in the handbooks. Our only source remains Athanasius himself:

When this champion of impiety and emperor of heresy, Constantius, heard these things, and that there were others in Spain agreeing with Hosius, he tried to get these also to subscribe. And when he was not able to compel them, he summoned Hosius. And instead of exile he detained him for a whole year in Sirmium. This pagan man neither feared God nor did the impious son honor his father's disposition, which favored Hosius, nor did the heartless one feel any shame toward his age—for he was now 100 years old. This contemporary Ahab, becoming another Belshazzar in our times, would not

103 Rhodanius's death is included with that of Paulinus by Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica* 2.45 (in de Senneville-Grave [n. 66 above], 330–32).

104 For instance, in *De Synodis* 90 (PL 10:542–43), Hilary, writing to Basil of Ancyra shortly after the publication of the Council of Ancyra's moderate formulation, mentions that bishops have brought him a copy. Beckwith, *Hilary of Poitiers*, brilliantly reconstructs Hilary's intellectual (and political) context during exile when the *De Trinitate* was edited into its current form.

overlook any of these things. He brought such violence to bear on the old man and detained him for so long that, though beaten down, he barely joined with Valens and Ursacius's group. Nevertheless he did not sign against Athanasius. But even so the old man did not evade his duty, for though he was about to die, as one making last arrangements, he gave testimony to the violence and anathematized the Arian heresy and recommended that no one accept it.<sup>105</sup>

Rather than forcing exile (έξορισμός), Athanasius paints a scene of Constantius "detaining" (κατέχειν) Hosius in Sirmium for a year, a scene that needs some interpretation. We can venture some specific dates for this detention, but they make it difficult to reconstruct the episode along the lines of Athanasius's narrative. Since the chronological end point of Hosius's detention, the second Council of Sirmium, began in the autumn of 357, we can place its beginning in the autumn of 356 ("whole year in Sirmium")—a full year after the fall-out from the Council of Milan and Liberius's exile. Constantius spent the winter of 356–57 in Milan, and after a short trip to Rome and campaigning in Pannonia he reached Sirmium only in October of 357.<sup>106</sup> So Constantius himself could not have been detaining Hosius in Sirmium or calling him into meetings with

the theologians of his court, as Athanasius seems to insinuate. It is tempting to reconstruct the episode differently: Constantius called Hosius to plan the next Council of Sirmium with the current bishop of that see, Germinius, who was a leading contributor to the camp of Ursacius and Valens.<sup>107</sup> Sozomen portrays the centenarian Hosius as yielding to the brutal pressure of Germinius along with his colleagues Ursacius and Valens, while Athanasius, underscoring the violence, strongly implies that Constantius was the agent.<sup>108</sup> More likely what Athanasius and Sozomen describe as the breaking of Hosius was actually a peacefully negotiated compromise, similar to that with Liberius, to reach some agreement with Ursacius and Valens's middle path of Christology ("semi-Arianism") without conceding that the condemnation of Athanasius should be put into question because of irregular ecclesiastical procedure.<sup>109</sup>

While such a counternarrative undermines Athanasius's intention to cast all events of this period as a titanic clash between Nicene and Arian forces, it serves to clarify Constantius's strategy toward bishops. Lesser figures such as Paulinus, Dionysius, Eusebius, and Lucifer could be safely shipped off to the eastern dioceses of their ecclesiastic enemies, while more important figures, such as Athanasius, Liberius, and Hosius, required more subtle treatment.<sup>110</sup> As we have seen, Liberius's clever abstention from the Council of Milan necessitated his risky abduction at night and

105 Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 45 (in Opitz 2:209): ταῦτα ἀκούσας δὲ τῆς ἀσέβειας προστάτης καὶ τῆς αἱρέσεως βασιλεὺς Κωνστάντιος καὶ, διὰ μάλιστα καὶ ἔπειροι εἰσὶ κατὰ τὰς Σπανίας ταῦτα τῷ ὄσιῳ φρονοῦντες, πειράσας κάκείνους ὑπογράψαι καὶ μὴ δυνηθεὶς ἀναγκάσαι μεταπέμπεται τὸν Ὅσιον. καὶ ἀντὶ ἔξορισμοῦ κατέχει τοῦτον ὅλον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν τῷ Σεμίῳ οὕτε τὸν θεὸν φοβηθεὶς ὁ ἄθεος οὕτε τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν διάθεσιν, ἣν εἶχε πρὸς τὸν Ὅσιον, αἰδεσθεὶς ὁ ἀνόσιος οὕτε τὸ γῆρας (ἐκατονταετῆς γὰρ λοιπὸν ἥν) αἰσχυνθεὶς ὁ ἀστοργος, πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα παρείδε διὰ τὴν ἀσέβειαν ὁ νέος Ἀχαϊὸς καὶ ἄλλος Βαλθασάρ ἐφ' ἡμῶν γεννόμενος, τοσαύτην γὰρ βίᾳν πεποίκη τῷ γέροντι καὶ τοσοῦτον αὐτὸν συνέσχεν, ὡς θλιβέντα αὐτὸν μόγις κοινωνῆσαι μὲν τοῖς περὶ Οὐάλεντα καὶ Οὐρσάκιον, μὴ ὑπογράψαι δὲ κατὰ Ἀθανασίου. ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως οὐκ ἡμέλησεν ὁ γέρων, μέλλων γὰρ ἀποθηνῆσκεν ὥσπερ διατιθέμενος ἐμαρτύρατο τὴν βίαν καὶ τὴν ἀρειανήν αἱρεσιν ἀγεθεμάτιξε καὶ παρηγγέλλε μηδένα ταυτὴν ἀποδέχεσθαι.

106 Amm. Marc. 16.10: Constantius left Rome on 29 May to fend off attacks in Pannonia. Ammianus mentions that Ursicinus was first called west to Sirmium to help out and then sent back east, along with the young Ammianus, to prepare for a Persian campaign. On this account, it is unlikely that Constantius left trusted officers in Sirmium; Ammianus strongly implies that his attention was turned toward Julian's successes in Gaul.

107 Germinius earned the status of villain in an extant text that appears to report a dialogue between him and a lay member of his flock, Heraclianus; C. P. Caspari, *Kirchenhistorische anecdoten: Nebst neuen Ausgaben partistischer und kirchlich-mittelalterlicher Schriften*, vol. 1 (Oslo, 1883), 133–47. In the context of our discussion, Heraclianus's charge rings true: *tu, qui pro scandalo hoc in populo praedicas, et Graece nosti dicere*. As an import from the Greek-speaking East, Germinius may well have been resented by the parochial Illyrian Christians.

108 Sozom., *HE* 4.12 (GCS 50:154); Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 45 (in Opitz 2:209): τοσαύτην γὰρ βίᾳν πεποίκη τῷ γέροντι καὶ τοσοῦτον αὐτὸν συνέσχεν, ὡς θλιβέντα αὐτὸν μόγις κοινωνῆσαι μὲν τοῖς περὶ Οὐάλεντα καὶ Οὐρσάκιον, μὴ ὑπογράψαι δὲ κατὰ Ἀθανασίου. Cf. above, n. 105.

109 Sozom., *HE* 4.12 (GCS 50:154).

110 Hilary's production of *De Synodis* and *De Trinitate* during his Phrygian exile seems to demonstrate a breakdown in the Phrygian exile strategy that had martyred Paulinus and Dionysius. On a more speculative note, the compromises forged by Hilary with his Galatian neighbor Basil of Ancyra may explain why his exile was less rigorous; another explanation, at least equally likely, is that Hilary's prominence required a different treatment.

his reeducation by Demophilus. But Hosius stood out as a unique figure. Few needed to be reminded of his special place in Constantine's court and the Council of Nicaea. Constantius, as Athanasius concedes in the passage quoted above, grew up in this court and heard his father honor the Spanish confessor's tireless efforts to arrange his great council. And Corduba in Spain was in the distant West, beyond the interest or influence of eastern Romans. So we must see the detention of Hosius as at once a sign of Constantius's desperation to silence western dissent and an indication of the limits of the emperor's power to discipline bishops. Yet despite those limits, the emperor's pressure apparently succeeded in bringing Hosius to a compromise by October 357; and, more importantly, Constantius's isolation of Athanasius was complete by November 356. With Paulinus, Eusebius, Lucifer, Liberius, Hilary, and Hosius all far from their own sees and from the potentially meddlesome court of Julian, Constantius had silenced all of Athanasius's western support. Just as the exiled bishop of Alexandria was mounting his political and verbal campaign against the emperor, his receptive audience had been neutralized.

### The Staged Deposition of Athanasius

While all this was under way in the West from around the time of the Council of Milan, Constantius had begun to act in the East. And by early February of 356 the *dux* Syrianus drove Athanasius from the city of Alexandria, most probably with a show of force, as described by Athanasius himself.<sup>111</sup> No doubt memories of Hermogenes' fatal attempt to remove the "exiled" bishop Paul from his see in Constantinople in 341 helped Syrianus succeed. After Athanasius confronted him concerning his orders from the emperor, the *dux* waited almost a month. Then he acted secretly and at night to occupy Athanasius's home church, surrounding it with a large armed guard. Athanasius tells us that he was spirited out by some monks against his will and calls his delivery miraculous. However this may have happened, it seems clear that Syrianus could easily have apprehended the bishop with his armed guard; the suspicion remains that he deliberately—and

probably acting under orders—allowed Athanasius to flee into exile. And some of his possible destinations were a cause of concern to Constantius.

### Non-Nicene Episcopal Exiles: Eudoxius, Basil, and Eustathius

Our story has been so deeply influenced by the powerful writings of Athanasius that we often overlook the exiling of Athanasius's enemies. The most colorful example of such an exile is that of Eudoxius. He was born and raised in the hinterland of Armenia, rose through the Eusebian party in the East, and was bishop of Germanicia by the time that he was delivering the Long Creed to Italy in 345. The latter fact assures us that Eudoxius had become an influential figure among the eastern bishops, and he had gained even more prestige by the time we next see him in Constantius's court. In 355, after the Council of Milan, he was among those helping the abducted Liberius to convert to a more moderate Christology and to condone Athanasius's condemnation. We may ask ourselves how a bishop of the Syrian hinterland came to be spending his time interrogating other bishops in Milan, but any satisfactory answer would have to highlight his intimacy with the imperial court and its theological strategies. The next episode in his career underscores this intimacy.

At the death of Leontius, bishop of Antioch, which probably occurred around December of 357, Eudoxius made the excuse that he had business to attend to in his diocese and then conspired to have himself appointed the new bishop of Antioch.<sup>112</sup> If we assume that the trip back to Antioch in the winter season was protracted, and that it took him some time to win the bishopric once there, then it is hard to imagine that he could have taken up the position before mid-spring of 358. The next stages are complex, and to sketch them we must pull information out of our sources. We know that Basil and Eustathius called a synod in Ancyra sometime around Easter of 358, and the letter sent from this council accuses Eudoxius of heresy.<sup>113</sup> We know that Eudoxius joined with Acacius's faction in the synod at Seleucia, which appeared to be the eastern twin to the synod at Ariminum. When discussion

<sup>111</sup> Athanasius, *Apologia de fuga* 24, in *Apologie à l'empereur Constance; Apologie pour sa fuite*, ed. and trans. J.-M. Szymusiak, SC 56 (Paris, 1958), 164–65.

<sup>112</sup> Sozom., *HE* 4.12 (GCS 50:154).

<sup>113</sup> Beckwith, *Hilary of Poitiers*, 57. Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.39 (SC 493:204); Sozom., *HE* 4.13 (GCS 50:155–56).

there broke down, Acacius and Eudoxius traveled swiftly to Constantinople (where they would call a synod, pass their creed, and send the news to Valens, Ursacius, and Germinius along with congratulations on the orthodoxy of their formula at Ariminum).<sup>114</sup> A synod that followed in Nike of Thrace on 10 October was designed to fool western bishops into signing on to this hidden, second Nicaean creed, and we are told that Eudoxius was thought to be involved in organizing it (presumably with Constantius's knowledge).<sup>115</sup> Sozomen quotes a letter sent from Constantius to Antioch stating that Eudoxius was not intended to be bishop of Antioch.<sup>116</sup> Socrates and Sozomen say that Constantius then exiled Eudoxius, while Philostorgius states that he was deposed and required to retire back to his home diocese.<sup>117</sup> Either way, the emperor's action must be seen as an uncanonical intrusion, with an effect very similar to exile.

Subsequent events make the career of Eudoxius more puzzling.<sup>118</sup> Presumably Constantius asked him to rig the Council of Nike, and then deposed and possibly exiled him. When he appears shortly thereafter, he is not just the imperially sanctioned bishop of Constantinople: he is dedicating the relics of Andrew and Luke in the new Church of the Holy Apostles, with the emperor in attendance. Such a momentous event must have been carefully planned: the new building designed to elevate Constantinople into the rarified company of cities with apostolic churches—at the time limited to Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, with Jerusalem coming on fast—capped the unification of imperial bishops. This event took place on 15 February 360, and leaves us wondering how

114 Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.39–41 (SC 493:206–22). Sozomen confuses the chronology (HE 4.12ff. [GCS 50:154ff.]). Cyril of Jerusalem is caught in the middle of this factionalism, apparently suffering exile at his rival Acacius's hands; H. J. Drijvers, *Cyril of Jerusalem: Bishop and City* (Leiden, 2004), and D. Kalleres, "Cultivating True Sight at the Center of the World: Cyril of Jerusalem and the Lenten Catechumenate," *ChHist* 74.3 (2005): 431–59.

115 Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.21 (GCS 44:158–59).

116 Sozom., *HE* 4.14 (GCS 50:157).

117 Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.8 (in Winkelmann [n. 19 above], 62): τὸν δὲ Εὐδόξιον τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἀποστάντα διαμένειν οἴκοι.

118 C. Kelly, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire* (London, 2004), 222, underscores the role of whispering campaigns, especially among the women in the court. Could these explain Eudoxius's vacillations of fortune?

Eudoxius could rise from outlawed exile to bishop of Constantinople in a period of about fifteen months.<sup>119</sup> One easy explanation would be that Eudoxius was exiled out of Antioch as a temporary expedient, as Philostorgius implies, but never exiled far from the imperial court's schemes.<sup>120</sup> Constantius could not let the complaints of Basil and Eustathius, however justified, derail his eastern synod in Seleucia (originally planned for Nicomedia). So he could toss them a bone by removing Eudoxius, knowing that the plan all along was to raise him to the capital see in a little more than a year. Yet in spite of all this intrigue and maneuvering, the record shows that Constantius exiled a bishop whose theological views were close to those of his court.

But another piece of information in our sources supports a different reading of the strange exile and return of Eudoxius and also bears on our subject. Philostorgius tells us that seventy bishops were exiled through the testimony of Basil and Eustathius.<sup>121</sup> If this account can be trusted, then surely Eudoxius would have been one of these seventy, since he had drawn the antagonism of those allied with Basil and Eustathius in Ancyra. Philostorgius then describes how the decision to exile them was reversed:

After this when Acacius convinced the emperor to oppose the party of Basil and Eustathius and hinted at various charges against other bishops, they were deposed. The emperor also deposed Macedonius, the bishop of Constantinople.

119 D. Woods, "The Date of the Translation of the Relics of SS. Luke and Andrew to Constantinople," *VChr* 45.3 (1991): 286–92, at 289.

120 Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.8 (in Winkelmann, 62).

121 Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.8 (in Winkelmann, 62): "He says that Basil, having taken with him Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, and other leaders of the churches, brought charges to the emperor against Aetius and Eudoxius, alleging various things, but especially that they were aware of the conspiracy against Gallus, and had actually participated in it. Theophilus too was implicated in the same series of charges. The emperor believed the story of Basil, which was supported by the women, whom Basil had already brought over to his side, and accordingly sentenced Theophilus to exile, and banished him to Heraclea on the Pontus, while he ordered Eudoxius to leave Antioch, and to keep himself within his own house. . . . Eudoxius retired into Armenia, his native country. Others also, up to 70, were condemned by the testimony of Basil and his party, and were sent into exile."

With Macedonius gone, Eudoxius was transferred from Antioch to the capital's throne by the emperor's will. Also the ones who were deposed were exiled, Basil to Illyria and the rest each to varied destinations. As they were being sent into exile they rescinded their signatures that ratified the creed of Ariminum.<sup>122</sup>

Philostorgius presents here the only evidence to explain the wild vacillations of Eudoxius's fortune. He fell prey to a plot by Basil and Eustathius, probably enacted in the summer of 358, and then was vindicated by the pleading of Acacius, most likely in the winter of 359 after winning the race to Constantinople from the divided Council of Seleucia. The emperor's eyes were opened to Basil's scheming, and he returned the seventy from exile and sent the party of Basil into exile in their turn.<sup>123</sup> If we are to trust this Arian-leaning historian, then we can conclude that Constantius's theological opinions had little to do with his exiling. Bishops of the three major views—Nicene, Eusebian, and Anomaean—were all exiled in the interest of promoting unity.

In what specific ways did Constantius depart from his father's precedents? First, it is clear that Constantine did not rigorously uphold every conciliar sentence of deposition, as we have seen in the case of Athanasius. In fact, almost every council we have discussed had its legitimacy questioned by another council (e.g., Sirmium and Serdica) or, as in the case of the Council of Tyre, by the bishop of Rome. How could the emperor have decided which councils' depositions to execute, which to discuss further with his "concilium" before executing (as in the case of Tyre), and which to ignore? Paul of Constantinople was elected bishop by a council, deposed immediately by another council, defended by a third, reinstated by a fourth, and then deposed unilaterally by Constantius. Would only

the most recent synodical canons be relevant? Then what explains Constantius's decision here to act on the second in a long series of councils? Constantine had already faced this problem in the case of Athanasius and had set a precedent for his son: execute exile decrees from councils whose policy goals agree with the imperial will (e.g., Nicaea), but stall and prolong discussion of disagreeable verdicts (e.g., Tyre). It therefore is difficult to agree with Girardet and others who have developed an idealized vision of imperial jurisprudence.

Barnes contends, to the contrary, that Constantius did not innovate: "Constantius both consistently observed and explicitly reasserted the principle that a bishop could be condemned and deposed only by a council of his peers, whatever the charge."<sup>124</sup> But such a principle hardly accounts for Liberius's sudden departure from Rome, nor the overwhelming evidence that Constantius arranged the synod in Constantinople to banish Paul; the synod in Arles, for Paulinus; the synod in Milan, for Dionysius, Eusebius, and Lucifer; and the synod in Biterrae, for Hilary (and Rhodanius). In addition, the emperor more openly exiled squads of eastern bishops caught between dubiously canonical synods at the end of his reign: Constantine threatened extra-canonical exile (e.g., Athanasius, 328), imposed exile on canonically deposed bishops (e.g., Secundus and Theonas, 325), and "suggested" exile extracanonically in other cases (e.g., Athanasius, 325) while also avoiding conflict with bishops under canonical sentences of deposition (e.g., Marcellus of Ancyra). Constantius extracanonically exiled Paul (after conflicting decisions by synods); semi-canonically and systematically exiled Paulinus, Dionysius, Eusebius, Lucifer, Rhodanius, Hilary, Eudoxius, and some seventy other bishops in the East; extracanonically and illegally abducted and exiled Liberius (355); illegally sequestered Hosius (356); and extracanonically reinstated (345) and illegally forced into exile (356) Athanasius. All of these actions should be seen as innovations on Constantine's policy—and, viewed chronologically, they point to an evolving vision of episcopal exile.<sup>125</sup>

122 Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.* 5.1 (in Winkelmann, 66): μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀκάιος τοὺς περὶ Βασίλειον καὶ Εὐστάθιον, βασιλέα πείσας καὶ αἰτίαις ἄλλαις ἄλλαις ὑποβαλάνων, καθαιρεῖ τῶν θρόνων. καθαιρεῖ δὲ καὶ Μακεδόνιον τὸν Κωνσταντίνουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον. παυθέντος δὲ τοῦ Μακεδονίου, Εὐδόξιος ἐξ Ἀντιοχείας Κωνσταντίου γνώμη ἀντικαθιδρύεται τῷ θρόνῳ. ὑπερορίζονται δὲ καὶ οἱ καθαιρεθέντες, Βασίλειος μὲν εἰς Ἰλλυριούς, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἄλλοι ἄλλαχόσε· οἱ πρὸς τὴν ὑπερορίαν στελλόμενοι ἀθετοῦσι μὲν τὰς οἰκείας ὑπογραφάς, αἱς τὴν Ἐριμήνῳ πίστιν ὑπεσημήναντο.

123 Barnes, "Crimes of Basil" (n. 37 above), 550.

124 Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius* (n. 1 above), 132.

125 In the category of threatening exile, I pass over the technique of holding whole councils hostage until all the bishops sign. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 145 (esp. n. 11), says that Constantius held bishops against their will for months at Ariminum. See Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica* 43 (in de Senneville-Grave, 328): *ita dimissis legatis praefecto mandatum, ut synodus non ante laxaret*

The case of Paul in Constantinople taught Constantius several key lessons: do not merely retire (*σχολάζειν*) popular bishops, carefully choose a destination far from potential allies, then escort the exiles to, and detain them in, those destinations. The case of Athanasius's return to Alexandria taught another lesson that would drive policy from 353 through 356: once a bishop had a power base of broad support from geographically diverse bishops and Caesars or Augusti, he could not be returned to his original see.<sup>126</sup> By the time that Paulinus, Dionysius, Eusebius, Lucifer, Liberius, Hilary, and Hosius were neutralized, success seemed assured, especially after the compromises of Liberius and Hosius. In the winter of 360, following the Councils of Ariminum and Seleuceia when Athanasius seemed safely detached from his see and faculties of open dissent, the empire came as close to theological unity as it would for centuries. If

---

*quam conscriptae fidei consentire se omnes subscriptionibus profiterentur: ac, si qui pertinacius obstiterent, dummodo is numerus intra quindecim esset, in exsiliū pellerentur.*

126 Girardet, “L’édit d’Arles” (n. 1 above), 90–91, spells out a case for Constantius’s legal right to proceed against Athanasius under a *crimen laesae maiestatis*, which could easily cover Athanasius’s dealings with Constans, Magnentius, and Constantius. Liberius also was returned to his original see, but it is my contention that he showed opposition to the Council of Ariminum and would have caused even more difficulties if Constantius had maintained influence in Rome after Julian assumed the title Augustus in the winter of 360.

not for the unexpected rise to power of Julian, and Constantius’s sudden death, it is easy to imagine a relatively peaceful and unified Roman ecclesiastical establishment diversely gathered along the spectrum of Christologies presented at the Council of Constantinople in 360.

Constantius had reacted pragmatically to his bishops as they presented a series of unprecedented challenges. His efforts to exile the various bishops discussed above point to an evolving policy through which he moved beyond the precedents established by his father, Constantine; at the same time, neither precedents nor innovative policies followed any strict canonical or legal guidelines. Though this quick and panoramic view still leaves Athanasius at the heart of Constantius’s exile policy, a considerable number of exiles of various episcopal factions point to the emperor’s pragmatism. With his reputation as an insane enemy of orthodoxy already waning, it may be time to consider exiling the caricature of Constantius as religious fanatic.

Department of Classical  
Studies  
University of Richmond  
28 Westhampton Way  
Richmond, VA 23173  
wstevens@richmond.edu